

## SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

**DATE:** December 7, 2001

**TO:** Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman  
Tony Barrett, Department of Ecology

**COPY:** Steering Committee Members and Consultant Team

**FROM:** Dave Moss, Tt/KCM

**SUBJECT:** **Summary of NPDES Phase II Subcommittee Meeting**  
**Moses Lake Conference Center**  
**November 29, 2001 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm**

**PROJECT:** EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*  
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

---

### Subcommittee Meeting Attendees:

|                                    |                              |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ross Dunfee – Benton County        | John Knutson – Yakima County |
| Joe Wilson – City of Richland      | Tony Barrett – WDOE/Olympia  |
| Steve Plummer – City of Kennewick  | Dave Moss – Tt/KCM           |
| Lucy Peterschmidt – Spokane County | Sarah Hubbard-Gray – HGC     |
| Lloyd Brewer – City of Spokane     | Bob Alberts – City of Pasco  |
| Lars Hendron – City of Spokane     | Jim Ajax – City of Wenatchee |
| Tom Tebb – WDOE/Central            |                              |

### PURPOSE OF MEETING:

This meeting was held to gather the core subcommittee members and at-large members to discuss:

- ❖ The issues involved in developing a model program for the NPDES Phase II stormwater regulations;
- ❖ Related programs and activities pertinent to the work at hand;
- ❖ The simplicity and/or complexity of the model program and its application to various jurisdictions; and
- ❖ Other issues that will affect the content of the model program.

### AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Introductions of subcommittee members and members at-large
  2. Summary of this morning's discussion
  3. Purpose of the subcommittee
  4. Purpose of this afternoon's discussion
  5. Open discussion of NPDES Phase II stormwater issues
  6. NPDES Phase II Model Program outline
  7. Next steps
  8. Next meeting: date, time, and place
-

## **BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS (per each item of the agenda):**

1. Each member introduced himself or herself.
2. John Knutson (chair of the subcommittee for NPDES Phase II Model Program) briefly mentioned the discussion in the morning session.
3. John noted the purpose of the subcommittee was to guide the development of the model program for affected eastern Washington jurisdictions, and to assist Ecology with preparing the general permit.
4. John said the purpose of this afternoon's discussion was to flesh out the major issues, and discuss the basis outline of the program.
5. The floor was opened up for general, open discussion. The major items of the discussion are listed below, with a copy of the flip chart notes included on the following page.
  - a. Focus on minimum program to comply with NPDES.
  - b. Explain where credit can be obtained for other ongoing activities and programs.
  - c. Be careful with describing more than a "minimum" program (Volkswagen versus Cadillac).
  - d. Tony: Model Program may be a "continuum."
  - e. Possibly differentiate between the "basic" program and a "comprehensive" program.
  - f. Let local elected leaders decide how far to go beyond the minimum in their community (based on liability/risk, ESA, other programs such as flood management, shorelines, GMA, etc.).
  - g. For the cost estimate, assume there are no activities occurring prior to the permit that would count toward compliance. But list things that may be occurring that could count towards compliance and reduce costs.
  - h. Tony: There are likely to be "if-then" criteria in the permit that could result in additional requirements beyond the "basic" minimum program. These "if-then" criteria would relate to receiving waters and other local conditions.
  - i. Question: How might the subcommittee help develop more specific criteria for evaluating "borderline" communities? Help Ecology determine which of the communities need to obtain a permit and which don't.
6. Time was limited, so the outline of the model program was deferred to the next meeting.
7. For the next meeting:
  - ❖ The draft outline of a model program will be reviewed and discussed, with samples of program elements
  - ❖ Review the issues regarding a basic / minimum program and a more comprehensive program
  - ❖ Clarify the needs for preparing costs estimate for program implementation
  - ❖ Provide a list of other water quality programs (Tom Tebb has provided this on the last page)
8. The next meeting will be at the Moses Lake Conference Center on December 13, from 9am (verify) to 2pm. Lunch will be ordered at the beginning of meeting so that we can work through lunch.

## **FLIP CHART NOTES FROM SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING:**

- Identify and incorporate existing programs (e.g. recycling, yard debris, etc.)
- Ongoing Public Education (incorporate; take credit)
- Current Watershed Planning
- Allow Flexibility (allow some to do more than the minimum)
- TMDL Issues
- ESA Issues
- Define “Model” Program: Minimum or More Comprehensive?
- “Must” vs. “Recommended”
- Consider Smaller vs. Larger jurisdictions
- Program vs. Programs
- Many jurisdictions have limited resources!
- NPDES II Compliance may not meet ESA
- NPDES II only to meet Federal laws, but also have to add those requirements for compliance with state laws.
- Define “Model” ← Exemplary? vs. Example?
- Consider “Basic” vs. “Comprehensive”
- Consider “Minimum” + “Options”
- Consider “Basic” + “For More, Look Here (at these additional sources, references, etc.)
- Continuum of Options
- Allow increasing progression (e.g., Year 0 → Year 5)
- Musts – Added – Examples – Tools (Ordinances, etc.)
- Zero-based Cost vs. ~~Added Increment Cost~~
- If raise bar above minimum, then propose to justify because it’s cost effective and agreed by the Steering Committee.
- Consider “Adders” which are mandatory requirements by others
- In permit, may be some “If, then...” scenarios
- UIC 173-218 – Being rewritten
- Start with basic program, including drywells, then add other items, as appropriate, to build the program
- What are possible issues beyond NPDES requirements that should be considered?
- Samples – Available cost data for Subcommittee to consider

## **BEGINNING LIST OF WATER QUALITY REFERENCES (from Tom Tebb):**

### **Ecology's activities:**

#### Water Quality Standards

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/swqs/index.html>

#### Groundwater Standards

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/grndwtr/index.html>

#### Impaired Water Bodies in Washington State (303d list)

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/index.html>

#### Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) in Washington State

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/tmdl/index.html>

### **EPA's, Ecology (WA), DEQ Oregon and Idaho Activities:**

#### EPA Region 10's Water Quality Temperature Criteria Guidance

Project is intended to develop regional temperature criteria that would be protective of salmonids. States and tribes in the Pacific Northwest could then use this guidance when developing their temperature standards, as required by the Clean Water Act.

#### EPA Region 10's Water Quality Temperature Criteria Guidance (Project Status web site link):

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/1887fc8b0c8f2aee8825648f00528583/ce95a3704aeb5715882568c400784499?OpenDocument>

#### Columbia and Snake River Temperature and Dissolved Gas TMDL

The States of Idaho, Oregon and Washington and the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are working in coordination with the Columbia Basin Tribes to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) for Temperature and Total Dissolved Gas (TDG) on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

#### EPA Region 10's Columbia and Snake River Temperature and Dissolved Gas (TMDL web site link):

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/ac5dc0447a281f4e882569ed0073521f/5ea7af703639a1f788256a3000764938?opendocument>

G. Thomas Tebb, Section Manager  
Water Quality Program  
Central Regional Office  
(509) 457-7107  
(509) 575-2809 fax  
gteb461@ecy.wa.gov